REMARKS

I.   Status

Claims 1-42 are all the claim in the Application. However, claims 14-28 are withdrawn from consideration, so claims 1-13 and 29-42 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

By this Amendment, the specification has been amended, and claims 1-4, 6-11, 29-31, 34-39 and 42 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Accordingly, entry and consideration of the Amendment are respectfully requested.

II.   Response To Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 And §103

Claims 1-3, 6, 10-13, 29-31, 33-34, and 38-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Fishman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,871,236, hereafter Fishman). Claims 7-9 and 35-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishman. Claims 5 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishman in view of Olgaard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,740, hereafter Olgaard), and claims 4 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishman in view of Flom et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0054087, hereafter Flom). The Applicants traverse the above rejections for the following reasons.

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 29 and 42, is directed to a system, method and computer program product from implementing portable networking of multi-user applications, which includes the use of a portable server. The portable server, in

pertinent part, includes a mass memory module for storing large amounts of multi-user data that can be accessed and utilized by user terminals in the network. The advantage of the portable server is that it is small enough to be easily carried (i.e., hand-held) and can be implemented almost completely using existing technology. Moreover, because the portable server stores multi-user data, the user terminals in the network are able to maintain a reasonable size because they are not required to have large amounts of memory.

In the Office Action, the Examiner initially relies on Fishman for disclosing each and every element as recited in claims 1-3, 6, 10-13, 29-31, 33-34 and 38-42. The Applicants, however, respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusions with regard to Fishman. After a detailed review of Fishman, the reference fails to disclose a portable server with a mass memory module for storing multi-user data, as recited in independent claims 1, 29 and 42.

On the contrary, Fishman discloses a method, system and computer program product for caching transformed content in a mobile gateway. The Examiner, in the Office Action, relies specifically on the mobile gateway 250 illustrated in Fig. 2 for anticipating the portable server of the present invention stating that the mobile gateway is "functionally equivalent to a portable server." By definition, however, "portable" means something that is easily carried or moved, which is an accurate description of the server of the present invention. Fishman, on the other hand, appears to disclose the exact opposite suggesting instead that the mobile gateway 250 is not easily or conveniently moved (See col. 4, lines 18-28).

Specifically, Fishman suggests that the "mobile clients" 274, 276, 278 can be any type of computing device, ***and are not necessarily limited to devices that are easily and conveniently moved***. This statement in the specification is then directly followed by an example of a mobile client 279 being used as a mobile gateway. In other words, Fishman suggests that

mobile clients are generally portable (i.e., 274, 276, 278) unless they are meant to be used as mobile gateways (i.e., 279). Therefore, although in the figure 2 there is a mobile gateway 279 operating as a mobile client of the mobile gateway 250, there cannot be found any support in the specification to correlate mobile gateway 279 with a portable device. In fact, the corresponding part of the description (column 11, lines 1-15) teaches only that mobile gateways can be provided in a cascading manner to provide more flexibility in the customization of the content. The only logical conclusion that can be reached by a close reading of Fishman is that the mobile gateway 250 is not meant to be portable.

Additionally, the Applicants also maintain that neither Olgaard nor Flom appear to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Fishman to render obvious claims 1, 29 and 42. Specifically, these additional references fail to teach or suggest a portable server with a mass memory for portable networking of multi-user applications.

Olgaard teaches the use of a portable terminal as a wireless link in a interface roaming network. Specifically, in Fig. 1, the terminal 102 provides a connection between the interface client 110a and the server 104. Nothing in Olgaard appears to teach or suggest that the terminal 102 has server-type processing capabilities. In fact, Olgaard describes the terminal 102 as including only a visual display, an input device and telephone capabilities (See col. 4. lines 12-14).

Flom teaches a content manufacturing and distribution system for manufacturing, distributing and caching content over wireless or wired networks to portable devices. Similar to Olgaard, Flom teaches the use of portable devices, but no portable device appears to have the same server-type processing capabilities of the portable server of the present invention. In

particular, Flom fails to teach or suggest the use of a mass memory module used for storing multi-user data.

Although the Applicants believe that the above arguments are sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections to the claims, the Applicants have herein narrowed the claims to further distinguish the present invention for the cited prior art and to expedite prosecution of the application. More specifically, the claims have been amended to emphasize that the portable wireless server is "hand-held."

Based on the foregoing, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the teachings of Fishman, Olgaard and Flom, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in the claims. Namely, a portable, hand-held server with a mass memory for portable storing and networking of multi-user applications. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 29 and 42 are believed to be distinguishable over Fishman, Olgaard and Flom at least for the reasons noted above. Likewise, dependent claims 2-13 and 30-41 are also believed to be distinguishable over Fishman, Olgaard and Flom, based on their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 29.

III.   Request For Examiner Interview

The Applicants request an interview between the Examiner and the undersigned to discuss in more detail the distinguishable features between the present invention and the cited prior art. Please contact the undersigned prior to issuing an Office Action.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims and allowance of the application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No.4208-4044.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 4208-4044.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: 7/20/05   By: _____

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101

59836 v1